

Pam. Africa. -
East

Kelway, A.C.

113

THE STORY OF
KIKUYU AND SOME
CONSIDERATIONS ARISING
THEREFROM · BY ^{Albert} CLIFTON
✓ KELWAY, F.R.Hist.S. 1865-



PUBLISHED IN LONDON BY COPE & FENWICK
AT THE FAITH HOUSE, 22 BUCKINGHAM STREET
STRAND, W.C., AND IN AMERICA BY THE
YOUNG CHURCHMAN COMPANY AT MILWAUKEE

THE STORY OF
KIKUYU AND SOME
CONSIDERATIONS ARISING
THEREFROM · BY ^{Albert} CLIFTON
KELWAY, F.R.HIST.S.

1865-

Great Britain

PUBLISHED IN LONDON BY COPE & FENWICK
AT THE FAITH HOUSE, 22 BUCKINGHAM STREET
STRAND, W.C., AND IN AMERICA BY THE
YOUNG CHURCHMAN COMPANY AT MILWAUKEE

1915



PREFATORY NOTE

THE following sketch of what is generally known as the Kikuyu incident, and some considerations arising therefrom, is the expansion of an Address given to members of the English Church Union at Newbury, July 15, 1915, on the forty-first Anniversary of the South Berks District Union. It is now published by request, and will, it is hoped, assist towards a clearer understanding of this gravely important question, the final settlement of which deeply concerns every loyal member of the Church.

OCTOBER, 1915.

THE STORY OF KIKUYU

KIKUYU, and the great controversy to which that far-distant and hitherto almost unheard-of East African station has given a name, is very much in the minds of Churchmen at the present time. This is regrettable, but it is also inevitable, and through none of our seeking. What are the facts?

(1) In June, 1913, a conference of Protestant Missions with the Church Missionary Society took place at Kikuyu, British East Africa. At that Conference the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda, and several priests of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, committed themselves to a temporary Federation of Missionary Societies, with a view to the establishment of a new, united Protestant Church of East Africa and Uganda. When the Conference ended there was a united Communion service in the Presbyterian Mission Church at Kikuyu, the Bishop of Mombasa celebrating, and giving Communion to the representatives of the various sects,—Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and Friends.

(2) Arising out of this Conference, and the proposed Scheme of Federation embodied in its Resolutions, the Bishop of Zanzibar, in October, 1913, uttered a strong protest. This protest took the form of "an open letter" to the Bishop of St. Albans (Dr. Jacob), begging him and "all the Bishops of the Province, to join me in my request made to our Metropolitan (*the Archbishop of Canterbury*), that the matter of the Kikuyu Conference be heard and judged in our Provincial Court, before him and his comprovincial Bishops, according to the Catholic precedent; . . .". The Bishop of Zanzibar's

letter was entitled "Ecclesia Anglicana: What does she stand for?" (*Longmans, Green & Co.*)

(3) In February, 1914, after having seen both the Bishop of Uganda and the Bishop of Zanzibar, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated that there were no precedents for the trial of a Bishop outside a Province by a Provincial Court, but intimated that he intended to submit the matter to the consideration of the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (a committee of Bishops, appointed in 1910, to consider such important questions as might arise before another Conference), and that, after receiving their advice, he would make a statement on the matter.

(4) The Committee of Bishops met at Lambeth Palace on the last five days of July, 1914, and their deliberations were concluded just as the war broke out. Nine months later, in April, 1915, the reply of the Consultative Body to the two questions upon which their advice had been requested was published by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with His Grace's personal statement thereon. This statement was, in fact, an endorsement of the advice given by the Consultative Committee.

Thus it will be seen that the recurrence at this moment of the Kikuyu question, and the immense controversy which it was bound to arouse, is in no degree due to ourselves. Most of us, to use the words of the Archbishop, would gladly have allowed the whole matter to have remained "in the limbo whereinto it has in the march of larger events been pushed." Controversy, always distasteful, is never more so than now, when we are waging such a struggle as is unparalleled in the world's history, and when the very foundations of civilisation and humanity are being shaken by a catastrophe greater and more awful than the mind of man could have conceived. It is at this painful moment, however, that the Primate of All England has seen fit to publish his statement, and so for us there is no choice.

For the gravity of the questions affected by the statement demands our serious and immediate attention, while the position and character of the Primate and other prelates who have spoken elicit our profound respect.

I

The Story of Kikuyu and the events which took place therein during June, 1913, may be briefly told. And, first, as to the place itself. North of Zanzibar (nearer the Equator) lies Mombasa, on a little island on the coast. Westward the territory of British East Africa runs inland to the Victoria Nyanza, and for ecclesiastical purposes it is divided into two Episcopal dioceses, Mombasa and Uganda. The larger part of the diocese of Uganda consists of the Uganda Protectorate, but it also runs into the western portion of British East Africa. Mombasa and Uganda are connected by the Uganda Railway, which about midway in its six hundred miles' course passes through the fertile and thickly-populated country known as Kikuyu. As Bishop Willis tells us: "Two miles south of a little railway station which bears that name, in the midst of charming and thickly-wooded scenery, some 7,000 feet above sea level, and in a climate not unlike that of its native land (*Scotland*), stands the Church of Scotland diocesan station of Kikuyu. It was at this station, in June, 1913, that sixty missionaries, representing the different missionary societies working in British East Africa, met in conference."¹

By "the Church of Scotland" is meant the established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but the use of the word "diocesan" is puzzling, as dioceses form no part of the Presbyterian system. The dioceses of Mombasa and Uganda are missionary dioceses, formerly

¹ *The Kikuyu Conference: a Study in Christian Unity.* By J. J. Willis, Bishop of Uganda. (Longmans, Green & Co.)

in Eastern Equatorial Africa, and which belong to the sphere of influence of the Church Missionary Society. Mombasa, formed a diocese in 1884, had for its first Bishop, James Hannington, whose martyrdom in 1885 thrilled all hearts: Uganda became a separate diocese in 1897, and the story of work therein forms a notable chapter in the modern record of foreign missions. It is true to say that the work of the Church throughout Mombasa and Uganda is, and has been, dominated by the party which in England is generally described as "Low Church." When the Uganda Railway was opened in 1902, missionary opportunities arose all along the line; but the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda were unable to occupy the whole of the ground. Consequently other bodies came in, and thus there are in this district (beside our own) missions belonging to Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, and some smaller sects. There are also the Roman Catholic missions, and these are larger and stronger than those of any non-Roman body in the district, but they are outnumbered by the non-Roman missions taken collectively.

All these Missions, with their varying appeals, are labouring in what the Bishop of Uganda describes as a pagan country. And the paganism of Africa, the Bishop goes on to say, "may perhaps be best described by the one word—malleable. It possesses no literature, and has no fixed creed; its adherents are primitive tribes, without cohesion, and without influence; as a religion it is invertebrate and weak, and its followers forsake it for the first strong leader that crosses their path." Two creeds are contending for these people, Mohammedanism and Christianity. The former, as Bishop Willis says, is "a strong religion, with a very definite, clear-cut creed, whose adherents have the great merit of knowing their own minds." The agents of Islam, strong and united, are faced by those of a divided Christendom. The English Church Missions are stronger than those of

the other Christian bodies, and were first in the field. But the two Bishops at the head of them are in a difficult and well-nigh impossible position. As has been well pointed out, "they have got no strong faith, polity and worship, which distinguishes them from the Protestant bodies, as the Roman Mission has and the Universities' Mission has. Episcopacy is to them merely their form of Protestant ministry, and their undecorated churches (Mombasa does not exhibit a cross anywhere), and their Protestant handling of the Prayer Book, produce an atmosphere, an *éthos*, scarcely distinguishable from that of the non-Episcopal sects. Yet they are divided from them and confronted by a strong Roman Catholicism and a strong Mohammedanism. . . . Protestant Churchmanship is so placed out there that it finds it cannot stand up against the sects on the one side and Roman Catholicism on the other. It will not catholicise itself, so it must find some method of working in harmony with the sects." ¹

The Universities' Mission to Central Africa has already been mentioned, and here it may be explained that proceedings in Mombasa and Uganda are of serious importance to the Bishop of Zanzibar, inasmuch as the Universities' Mission in Ziguiland, in his diocese, adjoins the sphere of the Church Missionary Society. As Dr. Weston says : "Mombasa diocese lies on our Western boundary as well as to the North-West and North ; our Christians move about in British East Africa and Uganda, while some are resident there for years at a time ; and in fact we are so closely joined to the sphere of the Church Missionary Society that its actions have more influence upon us here than have the acts of the Bishop of Northern Rhodesia, who belongs to our own Society. Once more, in the long strip of East Africa from Guardafui to Mozambique there are only three Bishops in communion with the see of Canterbury : the Bishops of Mombasa, Uganda, and Zanzibar. The teaching of

¹ *All Saints', Margaret Street, Paper*, February, 1914.

these three men is daily watched and criticised by intelligent Moslems, who know our plans for them and seek earnestly to frustrate them. Already they know of our differences in ceremonial and the like : now they will see that on matters fundamental to the Christian Church one Bishop is alone against two ! ”

If we would understand the question of Kikuyu, and the wider issues which it raises, it is necessary for us to realize the conditions which have been described. For in some form or other these conditions are repeated again and again. The mission field is, in fact, full of potential “ Kikuyus,” and as members of the Catholic Church we must know what we are going to say to other religious bodies on the vital questions which emerge from the Kikuyu Conference. Sooner or later these questions had to be faced. Many influences have combined to bring this critical situation nearer,—notably the Student Christian movement, with its motto, “ The Evangelisation of the World in this generation,” and the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. The Student Christian movement is an inter-denominational effort, led by Dr. Mott, which aims at such fraternity and sympathy as is possible between Christians who are divided on matters of principle ; while the Edinburgh Conference is at any rate the most conspicuous example of the spirit which has produced Kikuyu, and which, we are plainly told, is preparing the way for a number of other “ Kikuyus ” all over the world.¹ Moreover, that of which Kikuyu was the outcome in 1913 was no new thing. The discussion of the federation of religious bodies in East Africa dates as far back as 1907, and the Resolutions passed at the Kikuyu Conference in June, 1913, were submitted, almost word for word, to a similar Conference of British East African missionaries held at Nairobi in 1909. Kikuyu, and the proceedings thereat, have simply

¹ *The Wider Issues of Kikuyu.* By the Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.D. (Chas. J. Thynne.)

brought matters to a head. This is a distinct advantage, for it enables us to face the issues, frankly and fairly, without further delay.

What are the questions which arise out of Kikuyu and the subsequent utterances thereon? Well, briefly, they are questions of (1) Ministry and (2) Intercommunion, and are embodied in the proposed Scheme of Federation as set forth in the Resolutions of the Kikuyu Conference, June, 1913. This is why Kikuyu becomes the test case. The events that have occurred there might have happened in many other places; but it is at Kikuyu that a definite scheme of federation was proposed,—a scheme which Evangelicals like Canon Barnes-Lawrence tell us involves great and vital issues.¹ In the words of Mr. Hooton, Kikuyu “is not a mere incident, as some are trying vainly to represent it,—it is a crisis.” Mr. Mackay, speaking for the opposing school of thought, says practically the same thing: “This is the most critical moment in the history of the Church of England since the Savoy Conference in 1661, and it is the work of the Savoy Conference which the Kikuyu Conference has set itself to undo.”² Upon the importance of the matter all parties are agreed.

The Kikuyu Conference was held, “with a view to ultimate Union of the National Churches,” and the scheme of federation which was drawn up included the following proposals:

Each body—the Church of England, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and certain others—was to retain its own distinctive characteristics, but there was to be common membership between the federated bodies, whether Episcopal or non-Episcopal; “regular administration of the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, by outward signs”; and a common form of church organisation.

¹ *The Movement towards Unity.* (Evangelical Alliance.)

² *All Saints’, Margaret Street, Paper*, February, 1914.

Each Society or Church (the latter word is commonly used in the Resolutions) joining the Federation was to be autonomous within its own sphere, and, with a view to the establishment of a new Native Protestant Church of East Africa and Uganda, the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda and the Heads of Protestant Missionary Societies pledged themselves (*a*) to admit to Communion a recognised member of any other Church; (*b*) to draw up and follow common courses of instruction, both for candidates for Baptism and candidates for Ordination; and (*c*) to admit to any pulpit a preacher recognised by his own Church.

As a pledge of good faith, and acting, as he tells us, in accordance with the spirit of the Conference, the Bishop of Mombasa celebrated the Holy Communion, on the last *evening* of the gathering, in the Presbyterian chapel at Kikuyu, and admitted to Communion as many delegates of the Protestant societies as cared to present themselves. Of the sixty missionaries who attended the Conference fifty signed the proposed Scheme of Federation, eighteen of the signatories belonging to the Church Missionary Society; twenty to the African Mission (which is an American inter-denominational body); nine to the Church of Scotland Mission; two to the United Methodist Mission; and one to the Nilotic Independent Mission. The Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda, while signing the proposed Scheme of Federation, announced that they would not enter upon it without "the full consent of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Church of England," and it was added that the "setting up of an East African Church, independent of historic Christianity, was never for a moment contemplated."

This, in brief, is what happened at Kikuyu, and such were the circumstances which led up to the Conference. With the details of the Scheme we need not concern ourselves at present. Broadly speaking, the three important points in this definite and considered Scheme were these :

(1) Episcopal ordination is not insisted on.

(2) Any one may be admitted to Communion, whether confirmed or not, whether he believes in the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist as taught by the Church of England or not, so long as he belongs to one of the Federated Churches.

(3) All or any Protestant bodies are taken into account, but Catholics, whether East or West, are completely ignored.

Assuredly, such proposals, to use the words of the Bishop of Zanzibar, "brought us to the parting of the ways, which we have so long dreaded and sought to avoid." Many irregular practices and isolated breaches of Church discipline had doubtless taken place before Kikuyu, both at home and abroad ; but here was something more or less official, and, as such, presenting a clearly defined issue, upon which the opinion of the ecclesiastical authorities in England was requested, with a view to the speedy adoption of the Scheme.

II

The Open Letter addressed to the Bishop of St. Albans in October, 1913, by the Bishop of Zanzibar, brought the events of Kikuyu into a prominence which they had not previously received. Dr. Weston's letter, however, was really concerned with three matters, and with two of these "disturbing incidents" the Bishop of St. Albans was to some extent associated—the toleration of "Foundations," and the condemnation of the Catholic League on account of a service held at Corringham, Essex, in July, 1913, when prayers invoking the aid of the Saints were used. We are here concerned with that part of the letter which deals with the Conference at Kikuyu. In it Dr. Weston acknowledged the "warm-hearted love of souls" of "the Protestantizing party" in British East Africa and Uganda, but pointed out

the negative side of "the Deposit" that the Conference was prepared to make over to the new Native African Church. It does not contain the Athanasian Creed, nor the rites of Confirmation and Absolution. It does not contain episcopacy. It provides no priest for the Celebration of Holy Communion, nor a rule of infant baptism; and, lastly, "it does not know the Catholic Church, or the Communion of Saints, except in such a general sense as is already admitted by the four Protestant bodies that have joined the Federation." To the Bishop of Zanzibar the matter was all the more serious, because, as we have said, the Universities' Mission in Ziguinchor is not far from the Church Missionary Society, and their spheres are contiguous. He went on to charge the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with heresy in their teaching as to the meaning and value of episcopacy. To his mind they are seriously wrong in remaining in an episcopal ministry, "which is to them merely an outward form, and to their Protestant neighbours a rock of offence."

Towards the end of his letter Dr. Weston writes:—

I therefore beg of you, my Lord, and with you all the Bishops of the Province, to join me in my request made to our Metropolitan, that the matter of the Kikuyu Conference be heard and judged in our Provincial Court, before him and his comprovincial Bishops, according to Catholic precedent.

As we have already said, the Archbishop of Canterbury, after having interviews with the Bishops of Uganda and Zanzibar and duly considering the latter prelate's request, ruled that he would not be justified in allowing proceedings for heresy and schism to be taken against the accused Bishops. His Grace, however, admitted that "as Metropolitan of the dioceses in the eastern part of Central Africa"—a relationship of which the nature and limits are not easily defined—he is closely concerned with things officially said and done therein. This being so, His Grace decided to seek the advice of the Central

Consultative Committee, formed at the wish of the Lambeth Conference in 1897, and recast by resolution of the Conference of 1908. This Consultative Body consists of fourteen Bishops, representative of various portions of the Anglican Communion, and among them are prelates who have already accepted proposals not wholly unlike those put forth at the Kikuyu Conference. Therefore, it was felt to be humanly impossible for them to consider the question of intercommunion in an impartial, judicial spirit. The Bishop of Zanzibar (February 14, 1914) entered a respectful protest upon this point, and upon the form in which the questions submitted to the Consultative Committee were cast. His Lordship also demurred to the Archbishop's use of the words "different branches of the Church of Christ" in speaking of the various nonconforming bodies in the mission field. The Archbishop's questions were, however, duly submitted to the Consultative Body, with a brief statement of the circumstances which had led up to them. The questions were as follows :—

(1) Do the provisions of the proposed (*Kikuyu*) Scheme contravene any principles of Church Order, the observance of which is obligatory upon the Bishops, the clergy, and the layworkers of the Church of England at home and abroad? If so, in what particulars?

(2) I desire to ask whether, due consideration being given to precedent and to all the circumstances of the case, the action of the Bishops who arranged and conducted the admittedly abnormal Service in question (*the United Communion at Kikuyu*) was, in the opinion of the Consultative Body, consistent or inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England.

The Bishop of Zanzibar's attitude towards the course taken by the Archbishop is clear. He sought the decision of a Province of the Catholic Church with which he believed himself to be in close relation. This appeal

the Archbishop refused to entertain, and referred the matter to a Committee of Bishops which has no power of speaking judicially. Therefore, the Bishop of Zanzibar declined to accept the opinions of the Consultative Committee as having due authority, and considered that any opinions which the Archbishop might formulate after receiving the report of the Consultative Committee would also be devoid of authority. It is important that this should be clearly realized at this moment, when the opinions of the Consultative Committee and the Archbishop's endorsement of these opinions are being considered.

III

The answer of the Consultative Body to the Archbishop's first question is that in their opinion the proposed scheme of federation for missionary societies is "quite distinctly the kind of change, or step in advance, which ought not to be made by a diocese, or group of dioceses, without opportunity given to the whole Communion, through the Lambeth Conference, to advise upon it, at least in its main principles." But they continue: "This recommendation of reference to the Lambeth Conference does not in any way mean that we suggest the postponement of the whole matter for four years. The parties who met at Kikuyu have formulated a number of suggestions for common action. Many, probably most, of these can be carried out by the method of mutual agreement. They tend to unity without any compromise of independence."

They then add that some proposals in the scheme require most careful consideration, notably three:

(1) They see "no essential difficulty in inviting a minister or lay person not of our Communion to address our people, provided that the Bishop inviting him, or authorising the invitation, is satisfied as to his qualifications."

(2) As to the admission to Holy Communion in Anglican Churches of communicants belonging to other denominations, they consider this more grave. They argue that the rule of Confirmation "in strictness forbids admission to the Holy Communion till the requirements of the Church have been complied with," Confirmation being not merely a condition of admission, but an Apostolic means of grace. Yet exceptions to the rule had to be allowed. They conclude that the matter is one for Episcopal discretion.

(3) As to reception of the Communion by members of our Church in non-Episcopal missions, their answer is: "We are bound to say that we cannot regard any such arrangements as consistent with the principles of the Church of England. In saying this we associate ourselves with the words used, though in a different order, by the Committee of the last Lambeth Conference on 'Re-union and Inter-Communion': 'It is no part of our duty, and therefore not our desire, to pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions. But Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it, and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves.'"

As to the Archbishop's second question, on the Kikuyu Communion Service, the answer is: "We desire to abstain from any expression of judgment about it. . . . But after saying this, we are bound to add that any attempt to treat it as a precedent, or to encourage habitual action of the kind, must be held to be inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England. It would be a very serious alteration of the terms of communion, made not by any deliberate and corporate resolution of the Church, but by sporadic action of individuals. However well intended, it would be subversive of Church order."

So far the "advice" of the Central Consultative Committee, in which, as may be seen, two mutually

destructive theories as to inter-communion are included. Members of non-Episcopal bodies, described by the Bishops as "communicants belonging to other denominations," are to be admitted to our altars at discretion, and their ministers allowed to preach in our pulpits, but the possibility of members of the Church of England communicating with non-Episcopal bodies is "a question on an altogether different level," and cannot be agreed to. As has been observed, members of non-Episcopal bodies are practically given to understand that there are several classes of the Lord's Supper, and that their class is not good enough for the communicants of the Church of England—a line of thought which is hardly likely to commend itself to Nonconformists.

The answers of the Consultative Body, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury's own statement in regard to the whole matter, were published on April 23, 1915 (*Macmillan*, 1s.). The statement is really a history of the controversy—the main facts of which have been described in the preceding pages—and in all essential points an endorsement of the reply of the Consultative Body, upon which it is based. It is, as might have been expected from the Archbishop, a carefully balanced statement. Thus, for example, after speaking of "the grave *onus probandi*" which is thrown "upon those who contend for the rigid and uncompromising maintenance of the absolutely exclusive rule" which marks all non-Episcopalians as *Extra Ecclesium*, the Archbishop adds: "On the other hand, the difficulty of showing that such a rule has ever been explicitly laid down by no means involves an approbation *en bloc* of the federation scheme drawn up at Kikuyu."

In his statement the Archbishop makes a pronouncement upon three main points, as follows:

- (1) Admission to our pulpits of men who have not been episcopally ordained.

As to this question the Archbishop concludes that no fundamental principle is involved in permitting men who

are not episcopally ordained—that is to say, in permitting Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and other Dissenting or Nonconforming Ministers—to preach in our pulpits, provided the Diocesan Bishop of the Church gives permission to such preachers, and that each is “the recognised leader of a Church”—that is, of some body dissenting from the Church. The Archbishop also considers that priests and deacons of the Church may, when invited to do so, extend, reciprocally, the ministry of the Word to Dissenting or Nonconforming bodies.

(2) Admission to our altars of persons who have not been episcopally confirmed.

On this question the Archbishop states that he has no hesitation in saying that in his opinion a Diocesan Bishop acts rightly in sanctioning, when circumstances seem to call for it, the admission of such to our altars, when the applicant is, as the Archbishop terms it, a devout Christian man; is out of reach of his own separate place of worship (“Church” the Archbishop calls it); is baptized; desires to avail himself of the opportunity of communicating at one of our altars; accepts the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of Faith and Practice, and the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian Belief; and, in particular, believes the absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the Word of God; believes in the divinity of Jesus Christ; and in the atoning death of our Lord as the ground of our forgiveness.

(3) The question of permitting members of the Church “to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of Ministers not episcopally ordained.”

Upon this question the Archbishop agrees with his Episcopal advisers, and says that to imagine the pronouncement he has made regarding the admission of Dissenters to our altars, carries with it, or implies,

permission for us to receive Communion at the hands of their ministers, "is greatly to misapprehend the position and to run the risk of creating serious confusion," "especially for simple and untutored people."

As to the united Communion Service at Kikuyu, while speaking of it with the warmest sympathy, the Archbishop regards it as "abnormal" and "irregular," and goes on to say: "I believe that we shall act rightly, and that the wisest and strongest missionaries believe that we shall act rightly, in abstaining at present from such services as the closing service held at Kikuyu, now that in a world of quick tidings and of ample talk they are shown to be open to the kind of misunderstandings which have arisen."

IV

This, then, briefly, is the story of Kikuyu, and the pronouncements to which what happened there has given rise; or, rather, it is the beginning of an infinitely larger story, with the development of which we are all of us vitally concerned and the shaping of which lies very much in our own hands. That is why we are bound to consider very carefully the events of the immediate past. As to the future, and our own part in regard to it, one or two points now claim our attention.

(1) The whole question is not one of optional and local discipline, affecting two or three missionary bishops in distant parts of the world. It is a matter of universal and obligatory principle. As that learned canonist, Mr. Bayfield Roberts, well puts it: "What is right in Kikuyu cannot be wrong in England: What is wrong in England cannot be right in Kikuyu." The matter is, in fact, the affair of every baptized member of the Church. This is all to the good, for it will surely drive us back to a consideration of foundation principles, about which in the ordinary way we are apt to think too

little,—will force us, in fact, to undertake what Bishop Gore terms “the painful duty of thinking.” As that prelate observes: “We Church people have of recent years shown ourselves unmistakably anxious to avoid questions of principle. We have let ourselves drift, and have been even disposed to rely upon the alleged habit of the Church of England to avoid plain expressions of principle, and to ‘tumble along,’ trusting that somehow it will emerge intact from the chapter of accidents.” Not for the first time in our history, the result of controversy will, we may well believe, spread the Faith, and in the Providence of God the contentions within the Church will prove again the most efficacious means for propagating His Truth. “From all false doctrine, heresy and schism, Good Lord, deliver us.” The words are familiar to the most sober Anglican, but are we always sensitive to their meaning? Kikuyu compels us to face this question: “Are the differences between the Church and the non-Episcopal bodies of an essential nature or not?” If, as we are confident, the answer is in the affirmative, we cannot, even for the sake of an appearance of unity, deal with these bodies on the basis of expediency. In common with the whole Church, East and West, we believe that the Episcopal ministry is an essential part of the constitution and continuity of the Catholic Church to which we belong. We believe, with the Archbishop, that “No new generation may get rid of it,”—it is fixed and binding for all time. How, therefore, can we officially recognise and have fellowship with self-formed ministries of which the Church knew absolutely nothing during the first fifteen centuries of her history, and which only came into existence through the very sin of schism from which we unceasingly pray to be delivered? To do so would be to betray our sacred trust, and to deny the teaching of the “one Catholic and Apostolic Church” to which we belong.

This is no doubtful or debatable matter. The con-

ference of Anglican bishops known as the "Lambeth Conference" has quite clearly defined its Rule of Faith, in words which will content us all :

We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, professing the faith of the primitive and undivided Church, as based on Scripture, defined by the four first General Councils. . . .

And again :

We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. . . do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils. . . .

This is not the place to explain or defend the Three-fold Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. With the Archbishop of Canterbury, we stand on the fact that "it comes down to us from Apostolic times" and is an "essential" element in the Church. Believing this, we are not free to condone schism, and to recognise officially ministries which have deliberately cut themselves off from the true succession in the Church. In this, as the Archbishop admits, we are standing on firm ground. We believe, with St. Cyprian, that the unity of the Church depends on (1) the Order of Bishops sent by Christ Himself ; and (2) the Sacraments which they minister. We cannot bargain about anything which involves the sacrifice of these root principles. As the Lambeth Conference has more than once declared, these points are essential. The conditions of Re-union laid down by that body in 1888 are the acceptance of :

1. The Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith.
2. The Apostles' and the Nicene Creed.
3. The two Sacraments of the Gospel—Baptism and Holy Communion.
4. The Historic Episcopate.

These are the vital principles for which the Church in England stands; from them she has never departed and never can depart. The two great divisions which have rent the visible Church in no way affected our position as to these points. The great division between East and West, or the more recent cleavage between Rome and ourselves, were schisms *in* the Body rather than schisms *of* the Body. By these divisions, grievous as they were, no portion of the Catholic Church lost the essential things—the Apostolic Succession, the Divinely appointed Sacraments, and the great Creeds were retained. The Church in England, as our Bishops have so strongly insisted all through the campaign against the Welsh Dioceses, was not created at the bidding of Parliament, three or four hundred years ago. She is an integral part of the Catholic Church, and, as such, is, and must always be, united by her faith and practice to the Holy Church throughout the world. That is the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and it is for this that she stands. As Mr. Williams finely puts it, “. . . there is no justification in the present, and no prospect in the future, for the Anglican Communion, unless it can declare itself to be undeniably, uncompromisingly, and unapologetically Catholic—not merely tolerating Catholicism, as one of three possible interpretations of its message, but owning itself frankly to have no message, and to possess no authority, other than that derived from the far more ancient, more august, and more venerable society of which it forms a part, the Church Catholic of Christ, the Israel of God.”¹

This is nothing novel,—no new position to which we are being rushed by the “advanced men” of to-day. It is the Prayer-Book position. Our formularies, as contained in that book, afford overwhelming evidence of this. The doctrine and discipline, the faith and the practice of the whole Church, are so apparent in this book that any attack on the one or the other of these

¹ *The Kikuyu Opinion*. By the Rev. N. P. Williams, M.A. (p. 23.)

things is seldom unaccompanied by a plea for Prayer-Book "revision." It is the Tractarian position, as witness the whole teaching of the great leaders who initiated the Catholic Revival in England. With Dr. Pusey, we are told, whenever there was any doubt he took one line, "The only question is, What has the Church of God said?" Mr. Keble considered it—

of the very last importance that we should keep in our own minds, and before all Christendom, the fact that we stand as Orthodox Catholics upon a constant virtual appeal to the Œcumenical voice of the Church, expressed by the Four Great Councils, and by general consent in all the ages during which she continued undivided.¹

Dr. Neale summed it up in his well-known phrase, "England's Church is Catholic, though England's self is not." And probably the doctrine which is now the subject of attack, that of Apostolic succession, will never be set forth more clearly and simply than he did it in his familiar hymn for Ascension Day :

Christ is gone up : yet ere He pass'd
From earth in heav'n to reign,
He form'd one holy Church to last
Till He should come again.

Whate'er we do, whate'er we say,
By it we must be led,
For though our Lord is far away,
His Church is in His stead.

But it is needless to accumulate evidence, ancient or modern, as to the strength of our position. The Archbishop of Canterbury has, perhaps unwittingly, borne witness to it by what may be termed the "significant silences" of his statement concerning the Catholic basis of our position in regard to the things considered. We have no need to content ourselves with "the words and acts of many leading High Churchmen of Caroline

¹ *Memoir of the Rev. John Keble.* (Coleridge.)

days." The ground on which we take our stand is firmer than that. Being an undoubted part of the Catholic Church, we are bound by the fundamental principles of that Church, and not merely by the words or acts of Churchmen, however prominent, High or Low, in this or any other century.

(2) Next as to the question of Re-union in its larger and wider sense—our union with "the Latin Church of the West as well as the Orthodox Churches of the East, to which we are still bound by common ties of Faith and Tradition." (The words are those of the Archbishop of York at Edinburgh, January 11, 1914.) Any scheme of re-union with these great bodies must involve our possession of the Historic Episcopate, the Sacraments, and the Creeds. If for the sake of outward union with members of modern bodies, who refuse to kneel at our altar-rails and receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost, we consent to forego our principles of faith and order which we share with all parts of the Catholic Church, East and West, how can we hope to promote the precious cause of the re-union of Christendom? As to this some figures are instructive. According to the accepted sources Christians in all the world to-day number 563,510,000. Of this number there are 392,000,000 Catholics :

Roman Catholics	272,000,000
Eastern Catholics	120,000,000
					<hr/>
Total	392,000,000
					<hr/>

Thus, in the whole world to-day considerably more than two-thirds of living Christians agree with us in holding as vital those historic principles of Catholicity which we have never abandoned. How could it do aught but hinder re-union with this vast preponderance of our fellow-Catholics, if we, in this portion of the Church, practically yielded these principles for the sake of outward union with the comparatively few Christians who

in recent centuries have chosen to separate themselves from the Catholic Church, and to reject her ministry and Sacraments? If we want re-union, to remove ourselves from all possibility of re-union with two-thirds of Christendom is a strange way of beginning to secure it. As Mr. Ronald Knox well puts it :

“If the Church of England is to be a bridge between the East and the West, if it is to be a bridge between the insularity of England and continentalism of Rome, then any move we may make must be in favour of greater strictness, not of greater laxity, in our conditions of membership. If the Church of England is meant to stand alone, and convince the world of error, then it must stand or fall by the principle of the Episcopate. If it is meant, as some hold, to be a bridge between Catholics and Protestants, then it must keep rigidly to a middle position, and stick to its guns ; it must accept no terms from either side, unless some concession is offered in return ; whereas at Kikuyu everything is conceded by us, nothing by the other bodies. But if the Church of England is to stand alone, and yet stand for nothing, to occupy a mediating position, and yet surrender every chance of effective mediation, what right in Heaven or earth has the Church of England to exist ? ”

(3) Lastly, we shall do well to realize that the statement in which the Archbishop of Canterbury has dealt with the Kikuyu questions is just that,—“a statement and nothing more,” as the Bishop of London terms it. Of course it is important ; any pronouncement by the successor of St. Augustine in the See of Canterbury is necessarily that. But the degree of importance largely depends upon the capacity in which the Archbishop writes. As to this point, the statement is clearly a reply to two Missionary Bishops who (as the Bishop of Oxford says) “are subject to the Archbishop in a relationship which it is very hard to define,” and who have desired His Grace’s advice. This advice is not at the moment of wider application. Upon this point the Bishop of London says :

“ The statement has not in any way been communicated to me by the Archbishop, nor have I founded upon it any directions which I have given to my clergy, and unless and until such action is taken my contention is that the clergy should rightly feel that, while of course everything which affects one part of the Church affects us all, it has no direct bearing, and was never meant to have, any direct bearing, upon the Diocese of London. We shall still live, ‘as we have aforetime,’ on terms of more than charity, of affectionate mutual respect, with all Christians who live in this diocese, and worship God in different ways from our own, but they will not be asked to occupy our pulpits any more than they have been of old, nor shall we expect to be asked to occupy theirs. Friendly intercourse is one thing ; official responsibility is quite another.”

The Bishop of Oxford is equally definite :

“ I think that it is my duty as a Bishop of the Anglican Communion to reassert what is the plain, and I believe the true, meaning of the rubric about Confirmation, and I shall hope later on to take some opportunity of explaining at greater length to my diocese why I cannot accept either the principles which seem to underlie the Archbishop’s opinion or his particular decision on Confirmation and on one other point. Meanwhile, it is quite plain to me that the opinion of the Archbishop does not bind us and is not intended to refer to us. The authority which is over us is that of the Bishops of the Province, with the Archbishop at their head, and not that of the Archbishop acting apart.”¹

In the September number of the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine* (1915), Bishop Gore dealt more fully with the Conference at Kikuyu, and with the conclusions arrived at by the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning it. In Dr. Gore’s opinion these conclusions seem to be “ a compromise based on no intelligible principle, and tending far beyond what is, at present, contemplated.”

¹ *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*. By the Bishop of Oxford.
(Mowbray and Co.)

In fact, the Bishop considers "in the long run there is no justification for refusing full recognition of Nonconformist Ministers, in view of the spiritual fruits of their labours, except the belief (1) that the episcopate is of the essence of a valid ministry, and (2) that an episcopally ordained priest is necessary for a valid Eucharist." This conclusion seems to him to be quite irresistible, however narrow and hard it may sound.

At a moment when many Churchmen are regarding the present situation with deep anxiety, and others, like the children of Ephraim, "being armed and carrying bows," are turning themselves back in the day of battle, we may gain some help and guidance from past conflicts—notably that which was aroused by the Gorham Judgment, in 1850. Considering that decision in his Charge later in the same year, Bishop Blomfield, whose sound Churchmanship will scarcely be questioned by our opponents to-day, said some very useful things, which apply to the present situation almost equally well. The Gorham Judgment, Dr. Blomfield remarked, "does not alter a single sentence or word of the Church's Creeds or formularies." And he went on to say :

"This is indeed an invaluable advantage possessed by the Church in her Book of Common Prayer, that it is a standing confutation of erroneous doctrine, a stated proclamation of Christian truth continually resounding in the ears, and carried home to the hearts, of all her members, and made familiar even to the most unlearned. As long as we retain unaltered our Book of Common Prayer, I do not think that we have much to fear from the diversity of opinions which may from time to time arise in the Church. A Clergyman may sometimes preach strange doctrines to his people ; but he must also formally contradict them as he reads the Liturgy of his Church. . . . Until the decrees and canons in which that (*her doctrine*) has been embodied, are altered ; until her solemn assertion of the truth in her Liturgy is silenced by her own act, and by virtue of her own synodical movement ; the Church cannot be said to have given

up any one feature of doctrinal truth, nor to have ceased from asserting it."

In the words of the Bishop's great contemporary, Dr. Pusey, "While the Prayer-Book is what it is, the Church will have such as we are." And as to the particular point attacked he truly adds: "In these days everything teaches the truth. Even its opponents are its teachers, because by their very opposition they are bringing it home to men's consciences." These words, spoken in 1867, are as true to-day as ever, and, believing them, we cannot be dismayed at the gravity of the situation which confronts us. If, in the words of the Archbishops of England (1897) the outcome is "to make plain for all time our doctrine about Holy Orders and other matters pertaining to them," we shall indeed have won a great victory, and drawn perceptibly nearer to the crown and completion of all our struggles,—the Re-union of Christendom, too long, alas, divided.

"Forsake us not, O God; until we have showed Thy strength unto this generation, and Thy power to all them that are yet for to come."

Just Published.

The Story of the Catholic Revival.

By

CLIFTON KELWAY, F.R.Hist.S.

NEW EDITION.

REVISED AND ENLARGED.

With 18 Illustrations.

"A good, popular history of the movement which meets a real need."—*Church Union Gazette.*

Price 1/6 net.

Some Recent Publications

ISSUED AT
THE FAITH HOUSE, LONDON.

The Story of Kikuyu.	Clifton Kelway	6d. net
The King's Enemies.	Rev. Bernard Hancock	6d. net
Pictures of Russian Worship.	Rev. J. A. Douglas	1/3 net
The Sacraments in Russia.	Rev. J. A. Douglas	1/3 net
The Story of the Catholic Revival.	Clifton Kelway	1/6 net
The Supreme Adventure.	Rev. A. H. Baverstock	1/6 net
Veritas Veritatum.	Rev. C. Steenbuch	1/6 net
Lord God of Battles.	A. E. Manning Foster	1/- and 1/6 net
The Little Missal for the Laity		1/6 net
The Priest as Confessor.	Rev. A. H. Baverstock.	2/6 net
The Blessed Virgin.	Rev. Canon Wirgman, D.D.	2/6 net
The Religious Communities of England.	Rev. A. T. Cameron	2/6 net
Monasticism in the Orthodox Churches.	Rev. N. F. Robinson, S.S.J.E.	2/6 net
The Russian Liturgy		5/- net
The Byzantine Office		5/- net
The Mystery of the Kingdom.	Rev. C. E. Douglas	7/6 net
The English Missal (New Edition)		50/- net
The Ordinary and Canon	(from above)	12/6 net

22, BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.